



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

RECENT ASSYRO-BABYLONIAN LITERATURE

Hebrew and Babylonian Literature. The Haskell Lectures delivered at Oberlin College in 1913, and since revised and enlarged, by MORRIS JASTROW, Jr., Ph.D., Professor of Semitic Languages in the University of Pennsylvania. New York: CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, 1914. pp. 376.

Professor Jastrow, the noted exponent of Babylonian-Assyrian religion, has given us a highly interesting book. Though the problems under consideration have continually occupied the attention of scholars, and have been discussed from all points of view, since the decipherment of the cuneiform inscriptions, yet under the genial treatment of the author, even well-known views assume a different aspect which arrests the attention of the reader. It looks as if the author, like some other scholars, has not remained quite untouched by the gentle wave of conservatism which in recent years made its appearance in the scholarly world. His book seems to present an attempt at reconciling opposite views of the moderns and the conservatives. By this treatment, certain inconsistencies and an appearance of eclecticism are unavoidable. But we earnestly hope that what the author says about the Hebrew traditions will become true of all the scholars who feel that higher criticism is not the path leading to truth, and yet still linger at the cross-way: 'We cannot expect a sudden departure from the normal.' The ideas which we consider inconsistencies are due to 'survivals of older views'.

The aim of this work is to give some of the aspects presented by a comparison of the Hebrew and Babylonian civilizations. The author has as little sympathy with those who draw comparisons to prove the dependency of Hebrew ideas upon those of Babylonia-Assyria, as with the conservatives whose sole aim

appears to be towards securing confirmation of the data presented by biblical records. He holds that we must apply to both the Hebrew and Babylonian traditions the factor of evolution and the assumption of a progress in religious thought. The Hebrews were subject to outside influences, like all other ethnic groups. The differentiating factor in their history is to be found in the outcome and not in its beginnings. Gradual growth must be assumed, and not a sudden departure from the normal. But the former involves survivals of older views and customs. We must therefore trace the process of growth in both traditions to show how far older views survived, and how far they were replaced.

But the fact that the Babylonian religious ideas, since the days of Hammurabi, to say the least, did not undergo any perceptible change, and thus for a period of about two thousand years remained stationary, apparently disproves the author's assumption of a gradual growth. It is true, the author anticipated this objection in his remark: 'The materialistic aspect of Babylonian and Assyrian civilizations prevented the fuller development of an ethical and spiritual factor in the growth of religious thought' (p. 220). However, the author will not maintain that the religions of the Egyptians, Phoenicians, and of all other ethnic groups in the vicinity of Israel were less materialistic than that of the Babylonians. Hence, if he is right 'that at one time the Hebrews shared, to all practical intent, the religion of their surroundings' (p. 25), the exceptional development of Israel's religious thought must either be considered a sudden departure from the normal, or we will have to assume that from the very beginnings of Israel's history there were no materialistic factors in its religious conceptions. Both assumptions are highly improbable. Thus, in this way, we will never arrive at the solution of the problem. We have to reckon with the factor of personality. The Hebrew ethical and spiritual conceptions did not develop among the people, but were carried into it and maintained, under the worst conditions, by the great personalities of Israel.

The book consists of five chapters and an Appendix. The first chapter deals with the relations between the Hebrews and Babylonians. The agreement between the traditions of both regarding the stories of the creation and deluge is due to the early contact when the Terahites emigrated from Ur, and not to that in the captivity. The Hebrews were in no mood to assimilate ideas from those who appeared to them in the light of ruthless destroyers. This opinion was already expressed by Renan in his *History of the People of Israel*. Besides, the religious thought of the masses was too advanced, even in the eighth century, to take up traditions which arose among a people in an early state of culture. They were incorporated, because they formed for many centuries part and parcel of the people's traditions. When they were submitted to the new ideals set up by the prophets, their original character was modified, until in the post-exilic period they assumed their present literary shape.

But if the Hebrews did not take over these stories in the captivity, what reason has the author for his assertion that their present literary shape was fixed in post-exilic times? The contention that the religious thought of the Hebrews in the eighth century was more advanced than that of other nations is not borne out by the biblical records. The prophets accuse them of idolatry and of all possible vices. Admitting the factor of evolution, was not there plenty of time for the growth of religious thought from Hammurabi to Moses?

The second chapter discusses the Hebrew and Babylonian accounts of creation. Several versions of them were current among both the Hebrews and Babylonians. The second Hebrew version has few points in common with the Babylonian versions, while the first contains many points of resemblance to the main type of the Babylonian creation stories. In the second, however, there is still a trace of the earlier materialism, while in the first, all traces of any materialistic aspects have been intentionally removed.

Seeing, however, that in the second version which belongs to a far less advanced period than the first, all traces of nature-

myths had been removed, we do not comprehend why the post-exilic compilers of the Priestly Code did not do the same in the first version. The author's suggestion, that the compiler did not wish to cut himself loose from popular traditions, is improbable. If the first version originally contained myths, they must have been distinct and plain as in the Babylonian stories of creation. In the former, however, in its present shape, the myths are so hidden and veiled that no scholar ever thought of them before the decipherment of the cuneiform inscriptions. Therefore, we can hardly believe that the contemporaries of the compiler were so sagacious as to recognize in his version their ancient favourite tales. The only myth we can find in the Priestly Code is its mythical existence.

In the third chapter, the author raises the old question, whether the Babylonians had an institution similar to the Hebrew sabbath. He answers it in the affirmative, but holds that the Hebrew sabbath is an expression of religious ideas utterly distinct from those which we find in the Babylonian religion.

However, as far as the biblical records are concerned, this question ought never to have been raised. The very fact that sabbath is connected with the creation of the world shows that the Bible does not claim it to be specifically Hebrew. Sabbath was observed before the promulgation of the Decalogue. Thus it must have been an ancient Semitic institution, the preservation of which is solely due to Israel. For this institution it is quite irrelevant whether the Babylonians had a similar day of rest.

The two last chapters deal with the views of life after death and the Hebrew and Babylonian ethics. The early conception of *sheol* 'hades' among the Hebrews differed in no essential point from that among the Babylonians. In all periods of Babylonian history we find the relationship to the gods never rising above a materialistic level. Their limitations of ethics show themselves also in what they regarded as the real aim of life: material blessings. The Hebrews started out with no

better equipment for the development of ethics than the Babylonians or any of the nations by which they were surrounded. But they rose superior to their surroundings. The prophets' conception of sin and atonement contrasts with that which we find in Babylonian penitential compositions. The sin implied in the latter is the neglect of some rite or some festival, while in the former, the thought throughout is that sin can only be forgiven, if there is a disposition to lead a life pleasing to a righteous power.

But it is beyond doubt that the Pentateuch, like the Babylonians, regards material blessings as the real aim of life, being the only reward promised Israel for its obedience to the Divine commandments. The prophets could not have had a superior conception. They threaten Israel for its disobedience to the law with the loss of the material blessings. What else can we expect? A distinction between material and spiritual blessings presupposes a pure conception of life after death and the doctrine of personal retribution. If these doctrines had not yet been developed, what else could have been the aim of life, if not material blessings? If, however, the conception of the prophets was more spiritual than that of the Mosaic Code, this fact alone ought to be regarded as incontrovertible proof that the latter dates from an earlier period.

As to the Babylonian conception of sin and atonement, it would be wrong to assert that the Babylonians did not include ethical faults and failings in their idea of sin. The *Shurpu* Series enumerates all possible transgressions on account of which the gods turn away from the sinner, and the demons take possession of him and plague him with all kinds of diseases. Thus, on this point, there is hardly any difference between the Hebrew and Babylonian conceptions. However, it seems that in the Babylonian religion, the sinner was forgiven social crimes without being required to make amends, while in that of Israel, sins of this kind could not be expiated without making amends.

In the Appendix, the author discusses the Hebrew and Babylonian accounts of the deluge, and deals especially with

the version found by Dr. Poebel in the Museum of the University of Pennsylvania, which he regards as the prototype of that on the eleventh tablet of the Gilgamesh Epic. But this version is written in Sumerian, and it is very precarious to draw conclusions from a Sumerian text, as the science of Sumerology has not yet quite outgrown its infancy.

Die biblische und die babylonische Gottesidee. Die israelitische Gottesauffassung im Lichte der altorientalischen Religionsgeschichte. Von D. Dr. JOHANNES HEHN, o. Professor an der Universität Würzburg. Mit 11 Abbildungen. Leipzig: J. C. HINRICHS'SCHE BUCHHANDLUNG, 1913. pp. 436.

The present volume deals with the frequently ventilated question, whether the biblical conception of the godhead is similar to that of the Babylonians and other oriental nations. It is a work of high scientific value, and its results will radically influence biblical research in that direction. The literature is consulted on all points concerned. It, therefore, contains such an amount of information on this subject hardly to be found elsewhere. The discussion of the various theories is absolutely fair and free from bias. Though the author on the vital points seems to be rather conservative, his book does not make the impression that he is looking for confirmation of preconceived points of view. The book consists of six chapters which discuss so many subjects of high importance that it is hardly possible to present a succinct summary of their contents. We can give only a few of the salient points and leading ideas.

The first chapter outlines the fundamental views of the Babylonians on the essence of the Godhead. The universe is governed by an infinite host of personal powers. In an earlier stage of culture, they were thought of as being within the cosmos; later, however, the latter became personified in the triad Anum, Bēl and Ea. Babylonian cosmogony being theogony, their cosmology must needs be theology. The multitude of the divine beings continually grows with the recognition and conception

of the powers of nature as separate elements. The solar planet being the centre of life, such a religion must be in the first place a solar cult. Though an astral religion, there is a dualism in the conception of the gods, they being conceived as persons and at the same time as stars in heaven. The Babylonians never succeeded in completely personifying them. The sexual differentiation in nature is reflected in the conception of masculine and feminine deities. Being persons, the gods had to be equipped with all human qualities.

The second chapter deals with the position of the Babylonians towards monotheism. The tendency of the Babylonian theology being specification of the elementary powers and consequently continual increase of deities, monotheistic tendencies are not to be expected. However, there is a certain inclination towards pantheism. 'The totality of the gods' is represented by the septenary supreme power, the seven planets. Notwithstanding this amalgamation, the other gods do not lose their separate existence and independent position. As to the attributes of the gods, Anum is the sum total of the godhead, theoretically at least; Enlil is the representative of sovereignty; Ea is the personification of the principle of wisdom and of the power of creation; Nannar appeared in a certain period as universal godhead. But there was practically a solar monotheism—the most prominent gods being solar deities—as well as a national monotheism, as the deity of a certain territory occupied there the highest position. Now and then we find also an 'affective' monotheism, that is to say, a certain deity became supreme on account of being preferred by a certain ruler or in a certain period. The transfer of attributes from one deity to another played a prominent part. By this procedure many of the gods became in every respect identical.

The third chapter investigates the relations of the religious beliefs of the peoples of Western Asia to the Babylonian religion and their attitude towards monotheism. The claim that the fundamental religious conceptions of the Semites originated in Babylonia is neither historical nor psychological. Similar

physical and cultural conditions will develop independently a similarity of religious conceptions. Certain forms, however, show distinct traces of Babylonian origin. The solar planet is also in the West the ruling factor. The religions of Phoenicia, Canaan, the Aramaeans, Hittites, Nabataeans and North and South Arabs are in the main similar to that of Babylonia, and do not show any advance towards Monotheism. But a pantheistic 'monism', regarding all the powers of nature as the world-pervading spirit, was developed in the Roman period, under the influence of philosophy, Judaism, and Christianity.

The fourth chapter investigates the question concerning the existence of an ancient common Semitic god *ilu* or *ēl*, and the meaning and use of the divine designations *ilu*, *ēl*, *ilāni*, *ēlim*, and *elohim*. The view that there was an ancient Semitic god *ilu-el*, who was the universal deity, the embodiment of divine power, and that polytheism belongs to a later period, is contrary to the real development and to the biblical records. The term *ilu-el* does not define the metaphysical essence of the godhead. It became a divine appellative in a later period. Among the Aramaeans, Phoenicians, and South Arabs, where it occurs alongside of the names of other gods, it was, like *ba'al* and *melek*, a mere appellative, and not a reminiscence of an ancient universal deity. The meaning of it as 'the God' *par excellence* presupposes a monotheistic conception.

The fifth chapter inquires into the meaning of the names *Jahweh*, *Jahweh Šebaot*, *El-Elyon*, and *El-Shaddai*. The introduction of the name of Jahweh into the religion of Israel was not an innovation. This name was known before in the pronunciation *Jahu* or *Jahō*. It was changed into *Jahweh* for the purpose of an interpretation which was of special importance for Israel. The name is not Babylonian, as there was no Babylonian god *Jau*. The appellation *Jahweh Šebaot* corresponds to the Babylonian *bēl kishshāti* 'the lord of all humanity'. *El-Elyon* is not the name of an old Canaanite deity. It expresses a religious conception, nearly on a level with the biblical monotheism, of those who were not worshippers of Jahweh. *El-*

Shaddai means 'the highest God', and thus is synonymous with *El-Elyon*.

The sixth chapter draws a comparison between the essential features of the Hebrew and Babylonian religions. The national-historical character of the religion of Israel is the basis of the biblical conception of the Godhead. Jahweh is the centre of the union of Israel. He became the national God, because Israel was His creation. This monotheism was not the outcome of philosophical speculations and reflections on His relations to the other gods and to the cosmos. He is transcendental and cannot be represented by images. There may have been images of Jahweh, but they were prohibited by the official religion. There was always an antagonism and a gap between the prophetic Mosaic religion and the popular religious conceptions. Anthropomorphisms and anthropopathisms could not be avoided, as man cannot think of God as person without transferring to Him human attributes. Jahweh being for Israel the only authority, the cause of everything, there is no room for personifications of natural phenomena and for beings which can be won or conquered by magic. Exclusiveness and intolerance are a natural outcome of the divine unity. As the God of the victors, He did not become the head of the Canaanite pantheon, at the conquest of Canaan. He is the God of the people, not of the ruling dynasty. Being the embodiment of justice, the fundament of the Hebrew constitution, the monotheism of Israel is purely ethical. This conception was bound to lead to universalism.

Though we have nothing but praise for the book as a whole, there are some important points which will have to be reconsidered. Concerning the fundamental conceptions of the Babylonian religion, the starting-point is a strict line drawn between that of the Sumerians and that of the Babylonian Semites. The solar cult is of Sumerian origin. It undoubtedly originated among an agricultural people, to whom the solar planet was an absolutely beneficial deity, the centre of life. The fact that most of the chief Babylonian gods bear a solar

character, while the god of storm phenomena plays only a secondary part, evidently shows that the birthplace of the solar cult was Babylonia, the vegetation of which was not dependent upon rain. In any other country, except Egypt, the god of rain is just as important as the sun-god.

To the inhabitants of the Arabian desert, however, the solar planet, though source of vegetation and thus necessary, appears as a terrible deity, and therefore could hardly have become their chief god. The same holds true of the beneficent storm-god. His thunder and lightning inspire them with terror, and they have no way of protection against him. The night is the only time in which they find respite from their sufferings from the heat, and are able to continue their migrations. They see in the lunar planet the ruler of the night. He becomes their protector, and therefore, chief god. Hence, the Semitic nomads must have had a lunar cult. But as soon as they had settled in Babylonia, and had become agriculturists, the sun was bound to become their chief god. The Semitic tribe, to whom the Hammurabi dynasty belonged, was in all probability in a nomadic state, when it entered Babylonia. Four of Hammurabi's predecessors bear names compounded either with Sin 'the moon-god' or with *Sumu*, an equivalent of Sin, because the lunar planet was still the chief god of the immigrants. Hammurabi, however, calls his son *Samsu-iluna* 'the sun is our god'. This great promoter of civilization announced thereby a new era in the religious conceptions of the immigrants and effected the complete amalgamation with the old inhabitants of the country. Hence, if the deities of the West Semites bear a solar character, we may see in this fact Babylonian influence.

Seeing that the lunar planet was the chief god of the Semitic nomads, the meaning of *ilu-el* as 'the God' *par excellence* deserves consideration. The moon being always surrounded by companions, the stars, the idea of plurality suggested itself, and the moon was given a plural designation *elohim*. The Hebrew calendar shows undeniable traces of a former lunar cult, not to mention historical traditions, as the association of Abraham

with Ur and Harra, the chief centres of the moon worship, the name of mount Sinai, undoubtedly connected with the name of the moon-god Sin, and the promulgation of the Decalogue in the third month Sivan which is called 'the month of the god Sin'. It is interesting to notice that the idea of monotheism is more conceivable in a solar than in a lunar religion, as the moon has associates which the sun has not. Hence the Hebrew monotheism is not the result of evolution.

As to the etymology of *ilu-el*, none of the explanations discussed by the author is satisfactory. May we suggest that it was among all Semites a loan-word from the Sumerian *ili* 'to be high'? But we must admit that it is hardly a coincidence that in Babylonian *Ana* means 'the highest god' and *ana* is also the preposition 'to', and that the same is true of Hebrew *el*. The often occurring phrase יֵשׁ (אֵין) לֵאלֹהֵי יָדִי 'it is (not) in the power of my hand' does not prove that *el* is derived from a root אָל 'to be powerful', and means 'power'. It is more likely that this phrase is a figure of speech, and literally means 'my hand is to god'. The idea expressed may be either of a close connexion with the god, which suggests power, or of a far-reaching hand from which even a god cannot escape, or of a hand which is superhuman, and rightly belongs to a divine being.

Concerning the etymology of *El-Shaddai*, the present writer agrees with the author that *Shaddai* is connected with Babylonian *shadū*, 'mountain', and means 'the highest God'. But this etymology will not explain the ending *ai* of *Shaddai*. Seeing that the *summus deus* is depicted by the Babylonians as rising between two mountains, which according to Winckler and others, is the highest point, called the *nibiru*, the pass between the two peaks of the Mountain of the World, may we suggest that *Shaddai* is a dual form, and *El-Shaddai* originally meant 'the God of the two Mountains'?

The appellation *Jahweh Šebaot* involves a highly important problem. It is noteworthy that the term *Šebaot*, either in connexion with *Jahweh*, or with *elohim*, or with both, occurs about three hundred times in the Old Testament, and is used by

nearly all the prophets, but it is nowhere found in the Pentateuch, nor in the Books of Joshua and the Judges. The omission of *Jahweh Šebaot* in these books may fairly be taken as a criterion for determining their age. According to the modern critics, a Jewish priest in Babylon wrote the whole history of Israel, beginning with the creation of the world down to the Babylonian captivity. This work is called the Priestly Code. This author was responsible for the literary style of these books. Seeing, however, that the appellation *Jahweh Šebaot* was used hundreds of times by the prophets, and must have been current among the people, shall we believe that the use of this divine designation did not occur to this author until he arrived at the compilation of the Book of Samuel? The author of Deuteronomy did not make use of this designation either. It is, therefore, obvious that the designation *Jahweh Šebaot* came into vogue at the period of Samuel, when we meet with it for the first time. That is generally admitted. But then we must draw the conclusion that the present literary shape of the earlier Books of the Old Testament belongs to an earlier period. The only objection to this conclusion is the remarkable fact that *Jahweh Šebaot* is never used by Ezekiel. This prophet is indeed suspected of having had a hand in the composition of the Pentateuch. The critics will have to maintain that the first seven biblical books were composed by this prophet. The other exilic prophets are just as fond of this designation as their pre-exilic predecessors.

The current opinion is, that *Jahweh Šebaot* means 'the Lord of the hosts of Israel'. Seeing, however, that in the Pentateuch Israel is frequently referred to as 'the hosts of Jahweh', it is strange that it never occurred to Moses or Joshua to speak of God as 'the Lord of the hosts'. On the other hand, we should have expected, at least once, the variation 'the Lord of the hosts of Israel'. We therefore believe in the other explanation that *Šebaot* refers to the heavenly hosts, the stars and planets.

Polytheism rests upon the idea that each deity has a limited sphere of activity. Therefore, one has to be on good terms

with all deities, and none ought to be neglected. In the popular Hebrew conception, Jahweh also was a deity with a limited sphere, and was most likely identified with some planet. Thus the people did not see any reason why they should not sacrifice to other gods as well. The prophets denounced this conception by proclaiming the God of Israel as *Jahweh Šebaot*, 'He who brought the *Šebaot* into existence'. He, therefore, is 'the God of the *Šebaot*', whose sphere is unlimited; for, all natural phenomena being identified with the stars and planets, it follows that the ruler of the heavenly host must possess unlimited power. May we suppose that Ezekiel was careful not to use an expression which implied a gross insult to the Babylonian astral religion?

The Latest Light on Bible Lands, by P. S. P. HANDCOCK, M.A.,
Lecturer of the Palestine Exploration Fund. London:
SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE, 1913.
pp. 371 and 103 illustrations.

The author of this volume gained, two years ago, a well-deserved reputation as an able and painstaking scholar by his work *Mesopotamian Archaeology*. His present work, which covers a wide field also, shows a combination of industry and ability. His object is to present a concise account of the excavations made in Babylonia, Assyria, Egypt, Syria, and Palestine, in so far as they throw light upon the Old Testament. This account will enable the reader to form some estimate of the inferences which may be drawn legitimately from them. For the most, the author's endeavour has been to allow the facts to speak for themselves. Only here and there, where it appeared necessary, he criticized theories which appeared to him to rest upon insufficient data.

The book consists of seven chapters and two Appendices. The first chapter surveys the Babylonian civilization and shows the light thrown by the excavations upon the earlier chapters of the Book of Genesis. After this introduction, it turns to the historical period of the Old Testament literature, the time

of Hammurabi. The second and third chapters deal with the Hebrews and the land of Canaan before the time of the Exodus. They contain numerous discussions of interesting problems, as the sites of the store-cities, Pithom and Ramses, the identity of the Pharaoh of the Exodus, the identification of the Ḥabiri with the Hebrews, the condition of Canaan before it was conquered by Israel, &c. The fourth and fifth chapters inform us about the status of Israel in Canaan and in the captivity down to the time of the Maccabees. They give a brief sketch of the Egyptian history from the time of Meneptah down to the overthrow of the nineteenth dynasty to which this king belongs. Starting with Shishak's invasion of Palestine, they describe the relations of Judah and Israel with the Assyrians and Babylonians, and outline the history of the Jews under the Persians, Ptolemies, and Seleucids, which is illustrated by the *Murashu* tablets and the Elephantine papyri. The sixth and seventh chapters give an account of the excavations carried on in Jerusalem, Lachish, Gezer, Jericho, Samaria, Megiddo, &c. The two Appendices deal with the North Semitic inscriptions and the Hittites.

It is a book well worth reading, as it contains a great amount of useful information, not only for the general reader, but also for biblical students. However, we must add that the inferences which the author draws from the records are not always convincing. It looks as if in biblical exegesis he is too much dependent on Driver, who in his later years had become more and more radical.

There are a few points to which the present writer takes exception. The author declines to accept the identification of the *Ḥabiri*, of the Amarna tablets with 'Ibrīm, 'Hebrews', on philological grounds, contending that Hebrew *ayin* is rendered into Babylonian *heth* only when it has a hard sound. He evidently overlooked the fact that the words בעל, זרוע, עין, עפר, עצר, which etymologically have an *ayin* with a soft sound, are written in the Amarna tablets with *heth* (see Böhl, *Die Sprache der Amarnabriefe*, 6). Besides proper names, as Ḥa-ab-di-ili alongside of Ab-di-ili, Ḥa-am-mu-ra-bi, alongside of Am-mu-ra-bi,

show that West Semitic *ayin* with the soft sound is rendered into Babylonian *heth*.

The author is wrong in believing that the acceptance of the identification of *Ḥabiri* with 'Ibrīm would entail the repudiation of vital elements in the Hebrew records. Nothing compels us to identify 'the 'Ibrīm' of the Amarna tablets with the Israelites in Egypt. If we survey all the passages in which the term 'Ibrīm occurs, we find that there must have been other nationalities besides the Israelites which were designated as Hebrews. The very fact that the Israelites are called Hebrews only by the non-Semitic Egyptians and Philistines, but never by any of their Semitic neighbours, seems to indicate that the latter belonged to the Hebrew race as well. If it had not been the case, the Moabite king Mesha would undoubtedly have called his enemies, the Israelites, by the name of 'Ibrīm. This term designates all the descendants of 'Eber. The author obviously did not consult Böhl's book, *Die Kanaanäer und Hebräer*, Leipzig, 1911, which thoroughly discusses this problem. A close investigation will even show that the term 'Ibrī in the laws of slavery (Exod. 21. 2 ; Deut. 15. 12) originally included all the members of the Hebrew race, and did not refer to the Israelites only.

The author's opinion that there is no objection to the identification of *Ḥabiri* with Hebron is unfounded. The root חבר, from which the name Hebron is derived, is rendered in the Amarna tablets into *ibru* (Knudtson's edition, 126, 16).

Manetho's story about the expulsion of the Hyksos need not be discredited, but it does not follow therefrom that the Israelites had been expelled at the same time. The latter undoubtedly came to Egypt during the rule of the Hyksos. This fact of course explains the high position of Joseph in this country. Being relations of the expelled ruling tribe, the Israelites naturally were suspected of being disloyal to the new dynasty and were treated as enemies. Their oppression must have taken place under a régime which immediately succeeded that of the Hyksos, thus under the eighteenth dynasty. There is no good reason to assume that they were oppressed two hundred and fifty years

later, under Ramses II. The Israelites never had a better opportunity to leave Egypt than at the death of Amenophis IV, the last king of the eighteenth dynasty, 1350 B.C., when Egypt was torn by civil strife, caused by the religious reforms of this king, and its prestige was very low abroad. Böhl (*l.c.*, p. 92) had already rightly contended that we have no reason to doubt Jephthah's date of three hundred years from his time to that of the Exodus (Judges 11. 26). Now seeing that in Jephthah's time Israel was oppressed by the Philistines and the Ammonites (*ibid.* 10. 7), and that Saul had to contend with the same enemies, we may reasonably conclude that the period of Saul and Samuel immediately followed that of Jephthah. Assigning forty years to the former and forty to David, the accession of Solomon took place 380 years after the Exodus, 970 B.C., a date which is historically undeniable. The error in the date of four hundred and eighty years given in 1 Kings 6. 1 could be easily explained by the assumption that the digits were expressed by perpendicular strokes, as in other Semitic inscriptions, and the transcriber read 'four', instead of 'three'.

The author mentions the opinions of Alfred Jeremias and Professor Naville that the Decalogue or the Mosaic Books were originally written in cuneiform characters. These opinions would have some justification if there were reason to doubt the existence of the Phoenician characters in Moses' time. The author, however, has called attention to the existence of a Phoenician inscription of the fifteenth century B.C. (p. 280). We thus see that the Phoenician characters were known before the time of Moses.

The Bible and the Spade. EDGAR J. BANKS, Ph.D., Field Director of the recent Babylonian Expedition of University of Chicago. New York: ASSOCIATION PRESS, 1913. pp. 193 and 19 illustrations.

This work was written for the general reader who has neither time nor patience to read the accounts of Oriental discoveries

by specialists. Each of the chapters, except the first which briefly outlines the history of the excavations, is headed by a biblical verse as a motto which is illustrated by the results of the discoveries. It contains forty-seven short chapters. Its purpose is to impress the reader that the biblical stories are not of a legendary character, but real history. It is a readable book, and many a reader will feel indebted to the author for the pleasant and useful time spent in its perusal. Books of this kind deserve recommendation. The work of destruction in biblical exegesis has been going on for a long time. In consequence, scepticism regarding the truth of the biblical narratives spreads among all classes of the people. Therefore, the knowledge that the Bible contains many facts which find confirmation in Babylonian and Egyptian records will check their hasty judgement and inspire them with more reverence for the Scriptures.

We notice that the author in saying: 'even as late as the year 70 A.D., during the revolt of Bar-Cochbar' (p. 166) evidently mixed up two historical events. The revolt of Bar-Cochba (not Cochbar) occurred 130 C.E., about sixty years after the destruction of Jerusalem.

The Philistines : their History and Civilization. By R. A. STEWARD MACALISTER, M.A., F.S.A., Professor of Celtic Archaeology, University College, Dublin. The Schweich Lectures, 1911. London: published for the British Academy by HUMPHREY MILFORD, Oxford University Press, Amen Corner, London, E.C., 1913. pp. 136 and 11 illustrations.

Many theories about the origin of the Philistines have been put forward by modern scholars. Some, like Stade, Tiele, and Schwally, assigned to them a Semitic origin. The prevailing opinion, however, is that they were non-Semites. As far as the biblical records are concerned, the evidence is in the favour of the latter view. The Philistines played a prominent part in the early history of the Israelites, and were their inveterate enemies. Yet in the stories of the patriarchs, we find them in intercourse, alliance,

and covenant with Abraham and Isaac. The enmity to their descendants can be explained only by the assumption that the inhabitants of the country subsequently called Philistaea, were supplanted by other tribes. The latter adopted in the course of time the Canaanite language, yet still continued in their hostile attitude to the Semites whom they had subjugated. Biblical tradition has recognized them as immigrants from Caphtor (Amos 9. 7). The fact that the struggles with the Philistines began in the times of Jephthah and Samson, according to the biblical records, apparently indicates that the former inhabitants of these territories had been on friendly terms with the Israelites. The non-circumcision of the Philistines strongly favours the theory of their non-Semitic origin.

The author of the present work who in the years 1899-1900 discovered several Philistine localities, and in 1902-1905 and 1907 excavated Gezer, is no doubt a reliable authority on Palestinian archaeology. In the present volume, full of information old and new and highly suggestive, he attempts to collect in a convenient form the data about the Philistines. But we regret to say that he is not unbiased. It looks as if this book were especially written for the purpose of vindicating the honour of the *Aryan* Philistines whose name in modern times has become a technical term for a person impervious to a higher influence of art and civilization. He maintains that they have been grievously wronged, as the Philistines were the real carriers of art and civilization in Palestine. He is even inclined to give them credit for the invention of the alphabet.

The book consists of four chapters which deal with the origin, history, land, and civilization of the Philistines. On the basis of the Hebrew and Egyptian records and a comparison of the Minoan civilizations, he arrives at the conclusion that the Philistines were a people composed of several clans, derived from Crete and the south-west corner of Asia Minor. From a papyrus containing the personal report of the adventures of an Egyptian messenger to the Lebanon, he proves that the domain of the Philistines was more extensive than the scanty strip of land

allowed to them in biblical maps. But this conclusion rests on the assumption that the *Zakkala* mentioned in the papyrus formed one of the Philistine clans and were identical with the *Kasluḫim* (Gen. 10. 14), which is rather precarious. His suggestion that Sisera was a Philistine deserves consideration. In his description of the Philistine cities, he especially deals with Ekron, the site of which is wrongly identified with the present village Akir, demonstrating by the route of the wanderings of the Ark that it is identical with the present village Dhikerin, though etymologically there can be no direct connexion between these two names. Highly interesting, though in a great many points unconvincing, is the fourth chapter, in which the author investigates the language, organization, religion, and the place of the Philistines in history and civilization.

Ancient Babylonia. By C. H. W. JOHNS, Litt.D., Master of St. Catharine College, Cambridge. (*The Cambridge Manuals of Science and Literature.*) Cambridge: at the UNIVERSITY PRESS, 1913. pp. 148. 8 illustrations and 1 map.

The author's book *Ancient Assyria*, published in the Cambridge Manuals, has now been followed by a companion volume which succinctly outlines the history of Ancient Babylonia. Coming from the pen of this great scholar, there is no need to say that it is, like the former, a reliable work. Considering the historical sources which from the Hammurabi period down to the second half of the eighth century are very scanty, and the limited space allotted to these Manuals, the author has done the best possible to acquaint the reader with the general character of Babylonian history. Still in such a work it is inevitable that there should not be some slight details capable of improvement or correction.

In the present, it is nigh impossible to give the exact dates of the Babylonian rulers. But one would expect, at least, approximate dates. It could be done in cases where Babylonian kings were contemporaries of those of Assyria whose dates are known. The reader has not always the time nor the opportunity to look up the dates in the Manual of the Assyrian history.

It is surprising to find that *An-ni Kishki*, in the Dates of Sumu-abu and Sumu-la-ilu is rendered by the author: 'the god Jau of Kish.' Now there is no doubt that it cannot be translated 'Anu of Kish'. The Date lists are written in classic Sumerian, and in that case we should expect the casus obliquus *An-na*, instead of the casus rectus *An-ni*. To read *Ana-ni*, as does Schorr (*Altbabyl. Rechtsurk.*, p. 583), is impossible. Linguistically, there is no objection against the rendering of NI by Jau (cf. S^a, col. I, 19). But in that case we would have to assume that the worship of Jau (= Jahweh) existed in Babylonia already in the third millennium B.C. This opinion was indeed held by scholars, but it was based upon the belief that the god *Ja-pi-um* (= *Ja-wi-um*) is mentioned in the oath formulae on tablets from Kish, in the reigns of Rim-Anum and Sumu-abu. Now, however, it is well known that *Ja-pi-um* is not the name of a god, but of a king who was a contemporary of Samu-abu and Rim-Anum (see p. 64). If NI is to be read Jau, we could assume that the name *Ja-pi-um* is a hypocoristicon of a name compounded with Jau. Seeing, however, that NI is also to be read *ili* = NI NI (S^a, col. I, 20), and there are weighty reasons to believe in the existence of an ancient West Semitic god *El*, the reading *Ili* = *El*, in the Dates, may also be considered.

Handbuch der altorientalischen Geisteskultur. Von Lic. Dr. ALFRED JEREMIAS, Pfarrer der Lutherkirche, Privatdozent an der Universität zu Leipzig. Mit 215 Bildern nach den Monumenten und zwei Sternkarten. Leipzig: J. C. HINRICHS'SCHE BUCHHANDLUNG, 1913. pp. 366.

This work is a most interesting contribution to the history of religion. This praise will be willingly bestowed upon it even by those who deny that Babylonia played such an important part in the development of religious thought. The less we are inclined to agree with the so-called Pan-Babylonian, the more we must admire the ingenuity of the scholars, especially of the late Hugo Winckler, who were able to erect such a splendid

edifice upon a fictitious ground. It offers also a useful lesson, which in our iconoclastic age is not out of season, in demonstrating that not all ingenious systems must needs be true. However, as to its validity, let us not judge hastily. It must be borne in mind that this system has aroused the most violent opposition among those who are believers in higher criticism. Pan-Babylonian is a natural enemy of the latter, though it is also opposed by the conservatives. Those who look with consternation at the havoc wrought in the mind of modern theologians by higher criticism must feel indebted to the originators of a theory by which a destructive system is challenged.

The Pan-Babylonians maintain that the whole civilization of the Euphrates valley points to the existence of a scientific and at the same time religious system founded upon an astronomical theory. From there it spread over the whole world and developed into many forms. For, the conception of the universe, as we find it expressed in all parts of the world, entirely precludes the possibility of an independent origin in different places, by the exact repetition which only transmission by a migration can satisfactorily explain. A natural deduction from this theory must be that Israel which ethnically and geographically stood near to the Babylonians must have possessed in the beginnings of its history a high grade of civilization, and could not have been a people with peasant religious conceptions. A theory of this kind cannot be agreeable to the higher critics whose pet theories are not a whit less fictitious than the Pan-Babylonism they oppose.

The most serious objection to the fundamental principle of this theory is that made by the astronomer Kugler, who contended that Babylonian astronomy does not date from an earlier period than the eighth century. However, the author of this volume has with many proofs ably demonstrated that Kugler is wrong on this point (see pp. 130-6).

Kugler, however, has made another objection to this theory which, as the author admits, is absolutely incontrovertible. It concerns the theory of the Ages which has the most important

bearing upon the Babylonian religious development in the Pan-Babylonian system and the biblical interpretation. It has been asserted that in the most remote period the vernal equinox was in the Zodiacal sign of Gemini 'the Twins', Sin and Nergal, i. e. moon and sun, in which the former took the foremost place. Therefore an Age of Gemini must have been an age of the moon-god. From about three thousand onward, the actual position of the vernal equinox was in the Taurus 'Bull', and the calendar was consequently behindhand, its reform having been carried out by Sargon of Akkad. The advancement of the vernal point was used by Hammurabi to glorify his own reign as the beginning of a new epoch. This new Age of Taurus bears a solar character. Marduk who was exalted by Hammurabi to the position of the chief of the gods is essentially the sun-god. In the eighth century, the vernal equinox retrograded into the sign of Aries 'Ram', and the calendar was again reformed by Nabū-naṣir. Upon the theory of the Ages is based the assumption that Oriental stories endow the bringer of a new era with the motifs of the astral figure who represents the beginning of a new Age.

Kugler, however, has proved that the Age of Gemini passed about 1,500 years before Sargon; thus his birth was not coincident with the new position of the vernal equinox. The Age of Taurus ended before Hammurabi; thus the elevation of Marduk has no connexion with this Age. The Age of Aries lasted till about the Christian era.

The present writer in his review of the author's work *The Old Testament in the Light of the Ancient East*, 1911, in this periodical (New Series, III, p. 579), found a great difficulty in reconciling the theory of the Ages with the biblical calendar. Seeing that in the Age of Taurus the year began with Iyar, the question presented itself: The Exodus having taken place in this Age, how could Nisan have been fixed as the beginning of the year? We see now that the biblical records are correct, as usual. The Exodus took place in the Age of Aries, in which Nisan was the beginning of the year.

The author is indeed compelled to admit that the division

of the time into Ages was based upon a wrong calculation, but still maintains its theoretical existence which served for a mythological application. This contention does not seem to be convincing. In the opinion of the present writer, however, the existence of such a theoretical system is not impossible. Jeroboam who introduced the worship of the Bull into Israel transferred the Feast of Tabernacles into the eighth month 'which he had devised of his own heart'. He evidently, without considering the actual position of the equinox, fixed Iyar as the first month, in accordance with the Age of Taurus 'the Bull', the worship of which he had introduced. The same may have been done by Hammurabi.

The author was evidently aware of the fact that by the downfall of the theory of the Ages, the application of the Ancient Oriental Teaching to the biblical literature was bound to encounter insurmountable difficulties. He therefore, for the present, left the Bible alone and confined himself to the exposition of the Babylonian religious system.

Another difficulty is to be found in the idea of a pre-established harmony between a celestial and a terrestrial image. It is admitted that in practice it is things terrestrial which are reflected in the heavens, but in theory it is the other way: the type is in the heavens. Then, how can the Pan-Babylonians assert that the whole organization of the Babylonian state was based upon an astronomical system? The political organization of the Babylonians must have been complete in all details before the astronomical system was developed, since the celestial world was a mirror of Babylonia.

But whatever objections we may have to some details, there is no justification for condemning the Babylonian theory altogether. Even if it is in many essential points open to criticism, the value of this work is not impaired thereby. It will always remain an exceedingly useful book of reference for the interpretation of religious texts. It contains a vast amount of learning, and is highly suggestive on every page.

Babylonian Liturgies. Sumerian Texts from the early period and from the Library of Ashurbanipal. For the most part transliterated and translated, with introduction and index, by STEPHEN LANGDON, Shillito Reader of Assyriology, Oxford. With 75 plates. Paris: LIBRAIRIE PAUL GEUTHNER, 1913. pp. LII + 151.

There is no need to dwell upon the importance of Babylonian liturgies for the history of the Babylonian religion. Where else can we expect to find the religious conceptions of the Babylonians more clearly expressed than in their prayer books? Of more general interest is the bearing they have upon biblical research. It is hardly to be doubted that a close relationship exists between the Hebrew Psalms and the Babylonian liturgies, though this semblance is limited to the poetical form of both, and not to their contents; for the world of religious thought and feeling in Israel is incomparably deeper than that of Babylon. Now bearing in mind the high antiquity of the Babylonian liturgies, as most of them date from a remote period, the late dates generally assigned to the Hebrew Psalms are unwarranted. An early Babylonian influence upon the Hebrew religious conceptions cannot be denied. Hence, it would have been strange, if the Hebrews in a very early period of their history had not possessed liturgies similar to those of the Babylonians. Moreover, we may reasonably assume that the earliest literature of a primitive people consists of liturgies which were chanted during the sacrifices, in the honour of the deity. Those of the Hebrews may have undergone certain modifications to fit in with the conditions and the religious conceptions of the people. But on the whole, they may date back to a very early period. These problems can be solved only by a close comparison of the Babylonian liturgies with the Hebrew Psalms. In recent years, the material of this branch of literature at our disposal has been greatly increased by the publications of Zimmern, Thureau-Dangin, Scheil, and Radau. We now possess liturgies even from the time of the classical Sumerian period.

The name of the author of the present volume needs no

introduction to the scholarly world, and his works no recommendation. He is well known both as Assyriologist and expert in Sumerology of high repute, by his works, *Sumerian and Babylonian Psalms* (Paris, 1909), *A Sumerian Grammar* (Paris, 1911), and numerous other valuable contributions to Assyriology. The texts published in this volume consist of 209 numbers. They are for the most part small fragments of Sumerian liturgies copied for the Library of Ashurbanipal. None of the originals in their final form antedate the Cassite period. Not a few are duplicates of texts published before. There are several the contents of which are doubtful. The value of many would be insignificant but for the notes of the author, in which he shows that they are lost portions of already published liturgies. The introduction is a highly meritorious piece of work. It gives a preliminary history of Babylonian public worship. From the technical name for the psalmist in the pre-Sargonic period, the author infers that liturgical services originated among the Sumerians. He describes at length the names and the offices of the various kinds of psalmists and musicians who officiated at the services, the musical instruments used thereby, the technical liturgical terms, the character of the liturgies, the origin of longer litanies, the strophical arrangement and the metrical measures. We learn that the guilds of the psalmists became in a later age a kind of college which studied and edited the official liturgical literature. Interesting is the description of the ritual by which a bull, the symbol of the lyre, was consecrated to preside over this college, and a tambourine was dedicated. The texts containing the incantations used in these rituals are transliterated and translated. The index is a useful contribution to the history of Babylonian culture and religion. We should call it a glossary. It gives the names of the deities, temples, and their titles. The latter are for the most part translated. It contains a great many longer notes, in which the subjects under consideration are discussed.

The author also gives a transliteration and translation of a text published by Hugo Radau, *BE.*, XXIX, Nos. 2-3, which are variants. No. 2 is the original and came from the ancient

Sumerian Library of Nippur, while No. 3 is a neo-Babylonian copy with an interlinear Semitic translation, published by Georg Reisner, *Sumerisch-Babylonische Hymnen*, No. 71. Radau, who discovered the variant text of Reisner, has transliterated and translated both the original and its variant in his work cited above, pp. 63-74. Now it may interest some readers to know that in some portions of the text, where the Semitic translation is missing, there is not the least resemblance between the translations of Radau and of our author. Both are recognized as authorities on Sumerology, and yet one or both of them must be wide of the mark. Let us compare the following passages :

RADAU.

(2) When ravaging enemies as if with darkness the land with desolation (destruction) had filled.

(3) When the gods of the country into captivity they had led.

(8) A haven of safety nobody finds.

(10) The rivulets (canals) make precious (to rise), the innocent into the dust, oh do not cast !

LANGDON.

(2) Cool waters causing abundance, which as the morning light are brought into a barren land.

(3) Which the gods of the land caused to flow.

(8) The cities mourn (?) and men plant no more.

(10) The little canals where men perform hand-washings, give life to the soil no more.

The present writer, however, believes that our author's translation is more probable. These translations are characteristic of the present state of Sumerology, and teach us to receive with scepticism sensational announcements of newly discovered creation and deluge stories, written in Sumerian, which are claimed to be more in agreement with the biblical versions than the Semitic Babylonian stories. The translations are liable to be wrong altogether, if there are no Semitic translations to control the Sumerian text.

Vorderasiatische Schriftdenkmäler der Königlichen Museen zu Berlin. Herausgegeben von der Vorderasiatischen Abteilung. Heft II u. X. *Sumerische Kultlieder aus altbabylonischer Zeit.* Von HEINRICH ZIMMERN. Erste Reihe. Mit 8 Lichtdrucktafeln. Zweite Reihe. Mit 2 Lichtdrucktafeln. Leipzig : J. C. HINRICHS'SCHE BUCHHANDLUNG, 1912. pp. 64. 1913. pp. 56.

The texts published in the present volumes consist of hymns to various deities, prayers, incantations, &c. They are written in Sumerian and belong to an old Babylonian period. Texts of this kind are of high importance for our knowledge of the Babylonian religion, in demonstrating that the bilingual hymns and incantations of the Library of Ashurbanipal, of the neo-Babylonian and the Persian-Greek periods are not products of a late age, but present, as far as the Sumerian part is concerned, exact copies of the ancient Sumerian texts, with the exception of some slight deviations, a few additions and transformations. The texts of the Berlin Museum came from North Babylonia, Babylon, and Sippar, and are not of the same age as those excavated in South Babylonia, at Nippur and Telloh. The latter may claim a higher antiquity; their lowest date may be under the dynasty of Isin; while the former belong to the time of Hammurabi or of his immediate predecessor or successor.

The 216 numbers of religious texts contained in the present volumes are, as far as their external form is concerned, not of the same quality. There are tablets with several columns and large dimensions which, even in the choice and shaping of the clay, and especially in the script, frequently very minute, impress one that great care was bestowed upon their execution. They frequently contain a whole series of hymns, and were evidently manufactured for the temple libraries, where they were preserved as norms for later ages. But there are others of small size, with one column, of inferior and not carefully prepared clay and coarse large script. These latter evidently were of ephemeral character, being either school copies or votive offerings to some gods.

A great help to the study of these texts is the catalogue of the editor, Professor Zimmern. It describes the form of each tablet, gives the beginning of each hymn, in order to know to what series it belongs, and informs us of the parallels and duplicates in other publications. For the present, the parallels to the bilingual texts are of special interest. The contents of the other texts will hardly be an object of study to the great majority of the Assyriologists who are not experts in Sumerology. The editor, however, announces in the introduction his intention to publish in a number of the *Leipziger Semitistische Studien* a complete transliteration, with numerous restorations from parallels and duplicates, and, as far as possible, a translation of these texts. We hope that this work will soon make its appearance.

Grundzüge der Sumerischen Grammatik. Von FRIEDRICH DELITZSCH. Leipzig: J. C. HINRICHS'SCHE BUCHHANDLUNG, 1914. pp. 158.

Kleine Sumerische Sprachlehre für Nichtassyriologen. Grammatik, Vokabular, Textproben. Von FRIEDRICH DELITZSCH. Leipzig: J. C. HINRICHS'SCHE BUCHHANDLUNG, 1914. pp. 142.

The influence of Sumerian in Babylonian-Assyrian culture has been in recent years almost universally recognized. Some knowledge of this language is indispensable to a thorough understanding of Babylonian grammar as well as of Babylonian religion, law, and literature. Students of Assyriology have been for a long time looking forward to a reliable guide leading them into the bewildering labyrinth of this singular language. Though its structure is now established upon a scientific basis, a succinct grammar which should put the results within easy reach of the students was still wanting. Stephen Langdon's work, published a few years ago (*A Sumerian Grammar and Chrestomathy*, Paris, 1911), is too technical to serve as a book of reference. Nevertheless, it will be of inestimable service to one who is desirous of making himself acquainted with all the problems of Sumerology, and has patience enough to study this book thoroughly.

In works of Friedrich Delitzsch, who, by his grammatical and lexicographical works, did more than any other scholar for the spread of Assyriology, we expect to find both utility and soundness. In respect to the former point, the present works fully come up to our expectations. Concerning the latter, there are still many points which partly cannot be regarded as final, and partly remain unsolved problems. However, the fault does not lie with the author, but with the present state of Sumerology, which has not yet quite outgrown its infancy. The author frankly admits that there still remains plenty of room for improvement and correction, and indicated it by the title of the first volume, *Fundamental Features of Sumerian Grammar*. Seeing, however, that the second volume, though primarily intended for the general linguist, clearly and briefly outlines the grammatical rules, it is to be regretted that the first volume which is intended for Assyriologists is not more extensive. From what we read we gain the impression that the author on many points has a great deal to say, and restricted himself to a mere hint for the sake of brevity. However, for this drawback the author is not to blame either. From the preface to the second volume we learn that the publication of this work was an afterthought.

In the first volume the grammar is preceded by a list of sources of the Sumerian literature from which the examples quoted are taken. This list itself is a useful help to the study of Sumerian. Many a student will feel indebted to the author for informing him where to look for Sumerian, bilingual, and *eme-sal* texts. The introduction discusses the bilingual inscriptions. The views expressed are well known and generally admitted. Owing to the difference in the mode of speech between the Sumerians and the Semites, the Semitic translations are not always reliable. From the many mistakes we learn that, as a rule, the Semitic priests did not possess a thorough knowledge of the Sumerian language. Even the Sumerian-Akkadian vocabularies should not be implicitly relied upon, as they contain a great many Semiticisms.

A special feature of this grammar is the sharp distinction drawn between the *eme-ku* and *eme-sal* forms. This distinction would be necessary, if the author did share the current opinion that *eme-sal* represents decayed Sumerian forms. But he rightly contends that *eme-sal* is just as ancient as the so-called classical forms of *eme-ku*. The bewildering number of the personal prefixes are classified and illustrated by many examples,¹ without suggesting any explanation for this singular phenomenon. The solution of this puzzle remains an important task for future research. The contention that *mu*, *ma*, as prefixes for the first person singular, are identical with the pronouns *ma*, *mu* for the first person singular, is unconvincing, since the same prefixes are used for the third person as well. We would rather see in all the prefixes *eme*, *ema*, *mu*, *ma*, *mi*, *mun*, *man*, *mib*, *im*, *um*, *am* derivations from the root *me* 'to be'. The nasal pronunciation of *m* may have brought forth the prefixes *ne*, *ni*, *in*, *an*, *nen*, *neb*. On the other hand, an interchange of the labials *m* and *b* may have developed the prefixes *ba*, *bi*, *ban*, *bab*, *ib*, *ab*, *ub*. The prefix *al* may have been caused by an interchange of the liquids. However, the existence of special prefixes *nen*, *neb*, *ban*, *bab*, *mun*, *man*, *mib* is not beyond doubt. The final *n* and *b* in these forms may stand for the infixes *ni* and *bi*, indicating the object, which in Semitic often remain untranslated.

The second volume is a model grammar. The contents and the arrangement are on the whole the same as in the former. The results are presented in a lucid and brief way, without being encumbered by discussions which require a knowledge of cuneiform. Each paragraph is illustrated by a few examples, with omission of the sources. The few selections from Sumerian literature have an interlinear literal translation, with notes referring to the paragraphs under consideration. It also contains a glossary.

The author's assertion, in the preface to the first volume, that the results presented in his grammar are based upon his own investigations, without having been influenced by opinions of other scholars, strikes one as singular. We do not doubt his

assertion, though we cannot understand how he knows of the achievements of Thureau-Dangin, to whom, as pioneer of Sumerological research, the present first volume is dedicated. As a matter of fact, there is not the least reference to any scholar in the whole book. Langdon's grammar is of course ignored. It is a new departure in scientific research. It was customary to credit scholars with the results of their studies, even if the author subsequently arrived at the identical results.

Die Namen der Körperteile im Assyrisch-Babylonischen. Eine lexikalisch-etymologische Studie. Von HARRI HOLMA. Leipzig: OTTO HARRASSOWITZ, 1911. pp. xix + 183.

The present volume is one of the most valuable contributions to Semitic philology made in the last decade. Its author, a Helsingfors scholar, investigates the names of the parts of the body in the Babylonian-Assyrian literature. He compares them with those in all other Semitic languages and frequently also with those in Egyptian, Coptic, and other idioms. The literature in which these names occur, their ideograms and the various views concerning their meanings, are thoroughly discussed. The introduction is highly suggestive. The bibliography and the indices are useful. A special feature of this work is a German-Assyrian glossary. Thus it is in every respect a splendid lexical-etymological study, and it will take an honourable place among the prominent works on comparative philology.

However, this subject is not only of importance philologically. It is also in other respects of great interest. In the first place, it touches a problem of ethnology. We find that the names of the head, eye, nose, mouth, lip, ear, heart, &c., are in all Semitic languages identical. Therefore, it is evident that these names date from a prehistoric time when the Semites still formed a united ethnological group. Seeing that many of them are identical with those of Egypt, we may conclude that they had already existed when the Egyptians separated themselves from the common home of the Semites and Hamites, and migrated to the West.

It further involves a problem of anthropology, the acquisition of speech by primitive man. In his first reflections on his relation to nature, his own body was the nearest field of experiment. The functions of the members of his own body were the first actions which attracted his attention. They must have been known to him in the earliest state of his development. Hence, in Semitic, as in all other languages, they represent the oldest stock of human speech. The oldest linear measures are designated by all nations by members of the human body. Seeing in all things of nature reflections of his own being, primitive man designated inanimate objects by the names of parts of his own body, as, for instance, *pi abulli* 'the mouth of the gate', *rēsh nāri* 'the head of the river', *lišān girri* 'the tongue of the fire', *appu īṣi* 'the nose of the tree', &c. Similar traces of anthropomorphisms are found in all languages. The primitive origin of these names is best seen in a great number of prepositions which originally were names of the parts of human body, in construct state, as *muḥ* 'upon' (crown of the head), *kirīb* 'in' (the intestines), &c., &c. It is a peculiarity of the Semites to express abstract ideas by concrete things.

From an anthropological point of view it is interesting to notice that the Semites did not distinguish between the upper and lower, front and back extremities. They did not coin special names for the fingers and the toes. The same is true of other languages. They date from a time when man did not distinguish between biped and quadruped beings. The distinction between the names of the members of the human body and those of animals belongs, as was recognized long ago, to a later period.

From the names of the various parts of the body we may infer that the Babylonians, previously to the time of the cuneiform records, that is, in a prehistoric age, had a relatively good knowledge of anatomy. The same must be true of the other Semites. It will explain the fact, in the opinion of the present writer, that the Rabbis possessed an exact knowledge of animal anatomy, as especially seen in the Tractate *Ḥulīn*. This problem

naturally involves the question concerning the age of Babylonian medicine.

Seeing that the names of the parts of the body had their origin in a primitive age, we find an explanation for the singular fact that many of them, which must have attracted the first attention of primitive man, are biliteral, as *pū* 'mouth', *idu* 'hand', *damu* 'blood', &c. They belong to a time when the Semitic tri-radicalism had not yet been developed. It is also noteworthy that none of the primitive names are formed with prefixes. The suffix *ānu* in *lishānu* 'tongue', and *girānu* 'throat', &c., was added in a later age.

Babylonian Records in the Library of J. Pierpont Morgan,
Parts I, II.

Babylonian Business Transactions of the first millennium B.C.

By ALBERT T. CLAY, Ph.D., William M. Laffan Professor
of Assyriology and Babylonian Literature, Yale University.
New York, MCMXII. pp. 49, plates of autographed texts 50,
heliotype reproductions IV.

*Legal Documents from Erech, dated in the Seleucid Era (312-65
B.C.),* by ALBERT T. CLAY, Ph.D., LL.D., William M. Laffan
Professor of Assyriology and Babylonian Literature, Yale
University. New York, MCMXIII. pp. 89, plates of autograph
reproductions 50, heliotype reproductions VII.

Professor Clay, who for many years has been engaged in augmenting the material of cuneiform inscriptions at our disposal by publishing several highly valuable volumes of business and legal documents from the Cassite and neo-Babylonian periods in the Museum of the University of Pennsylvania, has again placed scholars under obligation by making accessible a large number of Babylonian records of the Morgan Library Collection. The documents published in the present volumes cover a period of six hundred years (743-139), at least, with the exception of the first two numbers in the first volume which the author for

palaeographic considerations rightly assigns to Nabuchadnezzar I (about 1150 B.C.). The following two numbers are dated in the tenth and thirteenth year of Nabū-shum-ishkun. Historians generally assign to this king, the predecessor of Nabū-naṣir, a reign of six years (753-748). The author, therefore, contends that the number of years which this king reigned must be increased at least to thirteen. This date is now indeed given by Johns (*Ancient Babylonia*, 1913, p. 114). Seeing, however, that palaeographically these texts may just as well belong to the tenth century, as there is no great difference between them and those of Nabuchadnezzar I, it is possible to assign them to the reign of Nabū-shum-ishkun I, who was a contemporary of the Assyrian kings Adad-nirāri III and Tukulti-Ninib II (911-885).

The first volume consists of an introduction, an index of proper names, a catalogue, and 102 documents. The latter are for the most part personal contracts: land titles, rental of houses, sales of slaves, promissory notes, mortgages, assignments of obligations and agreements on oath to perform certain duties. The first 28, as well as other texts, belong to the class known as 'Temple Administrative Archives'. These contain principally payments to individuals in the Temple service, or are receipts for expenditures made in the interests of the Temple.

From the names of the places which are mentioned in the documents we learn their provenance. Twenty came from Babylon, twelve from Borsippa, ten from Dilbat, three from Sippar, two from Nippur, one from Cutha, and one from Erech. Several others came from less known localities. Nos. 2-28 do not contain any reference to the place where they were written. But they are said to have been found at Senkereh, the ancient Larsa, in South Babylonia.

The chief value of the texts from the early period is of a palaeographic character, because they are the first published documents of the age they represent. The oldest Babylonian document from this period, hitherto known, dates from the reign of Shalmaneser V. They are valuable also on account of the foreign names contained in them, many of which are West

Semitic. We notice that in No. 26, 7, the name *Shamash-la-sha-da'* is to be read *Shamash-ia-da'*. The other West Semitic name *Man-nu-ia-da'* (*ibid.*, 8, 14) is omitted in the index.

The author is evidently right in identifying Nabū-mukin-zēr, of No. 22, with the name of the king Ukin-zer, in the Babylonian King List A. This identification has already been made by Rogers (*Cuneiform Parallels*, Chronological Table). But Rogers does not seem to have known of this text, as it is dated in the fourth year of this king's reign, and he nevertheless, in accordance with the King List, assigns to Nabū-mukin-zēr a reign of three years. Johns (*l.c.*, p. 114) does not accept this identification, and thinks it probable that this king was the predecessor of Nabū-shum-ishkun II, a suggestion which the author also considers possible, though hardly probable.

Nos. 23-8 are dated by the years of the king's reign without containing the king's name. Are there palaeographic considerations which determined the author to place them after Nabū-mukin-zēr? The date of No. 23 seems remarkable. It contains after *shattu 4 (kam) sha sharri*, MU (hardly ZIR) NU TUK U. Is it to be read *shuma lā ishu(u)*, and does it mean 'in the fourth year of the king who has no name'? The author assigns, with a question-mark, No. 87 to Darius II, the successor of Artaxerxes I. But it is quite impossible, as this tablet is dated in the twenty-ninth year of Darius (cf. line 4) and Darius II reigned only twenty-one years (424-404). Besides, the title 'king of Babylon' was never borne by Xerxes' successors.

The author calls special attention to No. 98, which is dated at Erech, 190 B.C. It contains no less than fifteen names compounded with Anu, indicating that the worship of this deity seems to have predominated in this city to the very latest period. This phenomenon, however, is not altogether surprising, as we already know of a contract of the reign of Seleucus II, dated at Erech, which contains sixteen names compounded with Anu (see *K.B.*, IV, p. 313 ff.), and since it was customary in that period to name the child after his grandfather, the same names were bound to reappear again and again. What we find more remarkable is

the fact that the name of Anu is, without exception, written with the sign for the number sixty. This writing is never found in historical and religious inscriptions, and occurs only twice in proper names, in the reign of Cyrus, dated at Erech (see *ibid.*, p. 268), and in that of Darius (see Tallqvist (*Babyl. Namenbuch*). The representation of Anu by the number sixty designates him as the highest God. The documents of the second volume contain sixty-nine names compounded with Anu, borne by more than seven hundred persons, and in all of them Anu is invariably written with the same sign. This large number can hardly find its explanation in the fact that Anu was the chief god of this city. We do not proportionally find so many names compounded with Shamash in Sippar or with Marduk in Babylon. Only the future can tell whether Anu was so conspicuous in proper names in the pre-Seleucid periods. If it should be found that it was not the case, we would be compelled to assume that the worship of Anu came into prominence in the Seleucid era. The highest Babylonian god Anu was in all probability, as we shall farther see, identified with the highest Greek god Zeus, whose cult may have predominated under the Seleucids. The remarkable fact that we do not find the well-known temple *E-an-na* in these texts, but instead we meet with the names *Esh-gal* and *Bit-rish* 'the temple of the chief' (?), indicates a certain change or reform in the religious institutions of Erech.

The second volume contains an introduction, indices of proper names, a catalogue, and fifty-six contracts with nine transliterations and translations of selected texts. The documents, with only a few exceptions, are identified with the Temple or Temple property and income. The stipulation that it is Temple property, in the assignments of rights and transfers, indicates that the documents belonged to the Temple archives. Nineteen of these documents refer to the assignments of rights to receive the offerings made to temples or shrines at Erech. The fact that these documents belonged to the Temple archives explains, in the writer's opinion, the complete absence of Hebrew names, though there undoubtedly existed a great Jewish community in Erech, as in all Babylonian cities.

The pious Babylonian Jews had of course not the least connexion with the temples.

The Greek names in these documents are philologically and historically of high importance. They seemingly show that there were a number of Greeks at Erech. In a few instances, however, we find that these 'Greeks' were of Babylonian extraction; for example, *An-ti'-i-ku-su* (Antiochus) was grandson of *Anu-balāt-su-ikbi*; *Di-i-pa-ni'* (Diophanes) was grandson of *Kidin-Anu*; *Ni-ik-ar-qu-su* (Nikarchos) was son of *Akutu*, &c. In a few cases we find that Babylonians assumed a second Greek name. If we may judge from a few instances, it seems that the assumed Greek names were not taken at random, but corresponded more or less to their Babylonian names. A personal name compounded with the name of a deity indicates that its bearer was under the special protection of the same deity and its servant. The bearer of the name *Nānā-iddin* 'Nānā has given' was, as it were, the property of this goddess, to whom he owed his existence. Nānā-Ishtar, the goddess of fertility and vegetation, was no doubt identified with Demeter, the Greek goddess of fertility and vegetation. We indeed find that the bearer of the name *Nānā-iddin* assumed a Greek name *Di-me-ti-ri-ia* (Demetrios) 'belonging to Demeter'. It is hardly a coincidence that a certain *Anu-uballit*, the bearer of a name compounded with Anu, assumed a Greek name *Di-i-pa-tu-su* compounded with Dios. It seems to indicate that Anu was identified with Zeus. The title *rēshu* 'the chief' *par excellence* may have become an equivalent of Anu, the chief of the gods. The temple *Bit-rēsh* may mean, as suggested, 'the temple of the chief'. There indeed occurs the name *Ardi-rēsh* 'servant of the chief', as variant of *Ardi-Bit-rēsh*. Hence, the bearer of the name *Anu-balāt-su-ikbi* 'Anu has commanded that he should live', may have assumed the Greek name *Ki-ip-lu-u* (Kephalaïos) 'belonging to the chief'. The name *Di'-du-ur-e-su* (Diodoros) may be a translation of *Īshti-Anu* or *Nidinti-Anu* 'gift of Anu', *Di'-pa-ni'* (Diophanes), of *Nūr-Anu* 'light of Anu', *Di'-ki-te-e-su* (Diokēdēs), of *Kidin-Anu* 'charge of Anu', &c. These

suggestions, however, do not involve the question, whether the Babylonians were imbued with Greek culture. We must bear in mind that all the persons in these texts were connected with the temples. The fact that many of them had the right to enjoy portions of the Temple income seems to indicate that they belonged to priestly families. Therefore, some of them may have been well acquainted with Greek lore.

Le Prisme d'Assarhaddon, Roi d'Assyrie, 681-668. Par V. SCHEIL, Membre de l'Institut, Directeur d'Études à l'École Pratique des Hautes Études. Paris : ÉDOUARD CHAMPION, 1914. pp. 56 and 7 plates of photographed texts.

The great French scholar, Father Scheil, to whom Assyriology is so much indebted for his numerous publications of cuneiform texts and valuable contributions, again publishes in this booklet several new inscriptions which historically and philologically are of high interest. No. 1 contains an historical inscription of the king Esarhaddon, of whose reign many details have been hitherto unknown. The text of this inscription which is given in photographed reproductions (plates 1-5), is transliterated, translated, and commented upon. In the first column, Esarhaddon tells us that he was co-regent of his father and, on the advice of Shamash and Adad, proclaimed heir to the throne. His father assembled the royal house and they took the oath of allegiance to him, but an evil spirit came upon them, and they revolted. In the second column, he informs us of the defeat of his rival, and of his care for the gods who assisted him in overcoming his foes. The third column deals with his campaign against Sidon and its confederates. Several towns in the environments of Sidon are mentioned here for the first time. In the fourth column we are told about the subjugation of the Arabs. Of special interest for the history of religion are the names of Arabian deities : ^{ilu}*Da-a-a*, ^{ilu}*Nu-ha-a-a*, ^{ilu}*E-bi-ir-il-lu*, ^{ilu}*A-tar-ku-ru-ma-a-a*. The last two columns recapitulate various campaigns, tell about the king's relations with Elam and Gutium, and finish with the usual information

about the restoration of the palace ; the inscription is in some parts fragmentary.

There is another inscription which involves a problem of historical importance. It reads : 'I am *Ashur-e-til-ilani-mukin-apli*, king of the *kishshati*, king of Assyria, son of Sennacherib, king of the *kishshati*, king of Assyria, son of Sargon, king of the *kishshati*, king of Assyria.' It tells about restorations of temples of Assyria and Babylonia. Seeing that the successor of Sennacherib was Esarhaddon, the question arises : Who was this *Ashur-e-til-ilani-mukin-apli* who claimed to be son and successor of Sennacherib ? The author is inclined to identify him with Esarhaddon. Hugo Winckler (*Altorient. Forsch.*, II, pp. 53-9 ; 183-6) has already identified *Ashur-e-til-ilani-ukin(-in)-ni* (III R, 16, 2. 9) and *Ashur-e-til-mukin-apli* (*ibid.*, 16, 8) with the latter. But it is hard to believe in this identification. We would have to assume with Winckler that the original name of this king was *Ashur-aḥ-iddina*, who according to the will of his father was to be named when he became king *Ashur-etil-mukin-apli*, that, as a matter of fact, on his accession he assumed the name *Ashur-etil-ilani-mukin-apli* ; in official documents, however, he was called *Ashur-etil-ilani-ukin-ni*, and as soon as he was firmly established on his throne he assumed his original name *Ashur-aḥ-iddina*. Winckler's contention that Esarhaddon as *Ashur-e-til-ilani-ukin-ni* did not bear the title 'king of the *kishshati*', as this title was a special designation of the rulers of Harran which at that time was in possession of his brother, the rival king, would be disproved by our inscription, in which he is named 'king of the *kishshati*'. Its contents show also that it was not written at the time of this king's accession, as it enumerates restorations of temples in Assyria and Babylonia. May we assume that *Ashur-e-til-ilani-mukin-apli* was the name of a brother of Esarhaddon who maintained himself as rival king for a considerable time ?

Another interesting inscription is a prism of Sin-shar-ish-kun, the last king of Assyria, of whom hitherto very little was known. It deals with the building of a temple for Nabū and his consort

Tashmētu. The text is given in autography with transliteration and translation.

Urkunden des altbabylonischen Zivil- und Prozessrechts. Bearbeitet von M. SCHORR. (*Vorderasiatische Bibliothek.*) Leipzig: J. C. HINRICHS'SCHE BUCHHANDLUNG, 1913. pp. 618.

The substantial contents of the present work correspond to its voluminous appearance. The author has made a special study of old Babylonian legal documents and published valuable contributions to this branch of literature, and, therefore, may be looked upon as authority on this subject. The present volume deals with a selection from the old Babylonian legal documents of the period of the Hammurabi dynasty, consisting of various categories. Each category is treated separately, and has a general introduction in which the whole material is surveyed. The transliterations and translations of the documents are frequently accompanied by brief notes which deal with linguistic and antiquarian matters. Each document is headed by a note containing information about its provenance, first editor and its contents. The documents are divided into three main sections: family laws, such as marriage and divorce, laws of obligations, such as loans, and lawsuits. Each main section is again divided into subdivisions. The conclusions drawn from the various documents are given and thoroughly discussed in the subdivisions.

It is quite natural that the norms laid down in the Code of Hammurabi should form the key to the interpretation of these documents. The vast number of Babylonian contracts would be incomprehensible, if there had not been already in the most remote period a general law, that the validity of every transaction rests upon a written document attested by witnesses. But it is due to the character of a legal code that it does not regulate all practical questions of legal procedure and commercial intercourse. These regulations can be gleaned only from the legal documents. The relation of the latter to the Babylonian Code is somewhat similar to that of the Talmud to the biblical laws.

A comparison between the Code and the documents also shows a contrast between theory and practice. We see that the codification of the laws by Hammurabi was influenced by the older legal procedure, and that, owing to social changes, the laws have undergone modifications in a later period. These problems are discussed in the introductions to the divisions. Each of them is headed by a reference to a section of the Code the regulations of which are put into practice in the transactions.

Of immense value is the general introduction to this work. It describes at length, under several headings, the literature of old Babylonian jurisprudence, the various names by which the documents are designated in the cuneiform inscriptions, their form and depositories, script and language, their schematic character, the oath formulae in the documents, the witnesses, the seals and the dates. A useful addition to this work are the Babylonian and Sumerian glossaries and all the dates of the Hammurabi period. It is a work of high merit in every respect and will prove exceedingly useful to students who are interested in the Babylonian legal literature.

Das Priester- und Beamtentum der altbabylonischen Kontrakte.

Mit einer Zusammenstellung sämtlicher Kontrakte der I. Dynastie von Babylon in Regestenform. Ein Beitrag zur altbabylonischen Kulturgeschichte von Dr. phil. et theol. ERNEST LINDL, ao. Professor an der Universität München. (*Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums. Zweiter Ergänzungsband.*) Paderborn : FERDINAND SCHÖNINGH, 1913. pp. 514.

If the main contents of this work had not been an afterthought, the author would have reversed its titles and called it : A Classification of all legal documents of the time of the First Babylonian dynasty with a special reference to the priesthood and officialdom. It is exactly what this book does. The classification takes up about four hundred pages, while that of the priesthood and officialdom is dealt with on about eighty pages. The latter are

of course of no small importance for Babylonian history and religion. Seeing, however, that these names have already been mentioned in the former classification, an index might have served the same purpose.

This work is on the whole and in details a valuable contribution to Assyriological studies. It puts the entire material of the Old Babylonian contracts of the Hammurabi period, extant at present, at the student's disposal. It will be a useful help to those who are not thoroughly acquainted with the various kinds of Old Babylonian cursive writing.

It briefly presents the contents of each document, the names of the contracting parties and of the witnesses, the deities in the oath formulae, the place of the transaction and the dates. The arrangement was intended to be chronological. But after a small part had been printed, new publications made their appearance, and the author deemed it advisable for the sake of completeness to make addenda. The same happened several times. By this interruption of the chronological order, for which the author is not responsible, the survey of the material is somewhat laborious. In undated documents, the author always refers to other documents which are dated, where the identical names occur, and we thus learn to what period the former belong. Especially useful are the many transliterations and translations of technical legal terms.

Interesting is the historical Appendix (chapter VI), in which the author investigates the thirty years Isin era of Rim-Sin or Eri-Aku, the contemporary of Hammurabi. Among others, the author contends that Warad-Sin and Rim-sin are identical, and not brothers, as generally believed. As king of the Sumerian city Larsa, his name was written ideographically Warad-Sin, while after the conquest of the Semitic city Isin, his name was written syllabically Ri-im-Sin or Ri-im-Aku.

Zur Götterlehre in den altbabylonischen Königsinschriften. Mit einem ausführlichen Register der auf die Götterlehre bezüglichen Stellen. Von Dr. P. THARSICIUS PAFFRATH, O.F.M.,

Lector der Theologie. (*Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums*. Sechster Band, 5. und 6. Heft.) Paderborn: FERDINAND SCHÖNINGH, 1913. pp. 226 and 8 illustrations.

A work of this kind has been a desideratum for a long time. It may be designated as a prolegomena to a history of the Babylonian religion, though not in the full sense of the term, as the material upon which this investigation rests is not complete. The post-Hammurabi literature ought to have been consulted as well. New discoveries of earlier Babylonian documents may of course lead to different conclusions. But in the present state of the science, it tells us everything we want to know about the position, attributes, and mutual relations of the various deities from the earliest Babylonian times down to the Hammurabi dynasty. It thus presents a vivid picture of the development and formation of the Babylonian pantheon.

Of special interest is the chapter which investigates the positions of Anu and Enlil in ancient Babylonia. The former, the highest god of the Babylonians, does not occur in historical inscriptions of Lagash previous to the time of Urukagina. From this fact, the author concludes that the introduction of Anu's cult was due to a political change, the conquest of Lagash by Lugalzaggisi who was king of Erech, the centre of Anu's cult, in South Babylonia. If the author is right, we have also here, as in the case of Marduk, an example how religious conceptions are influenced by political changes. The fact, that the elevation of Anu remained, theoretically at least, permanent in Lagash and throughout Babylonia, would indicate that the rule of Erech lasted for a considerable period. According to these conclusions, Radau (*Sumerian Hymns and Prayers to God Ninib*, Introduction) is evidently wrong in regarding the age of Anu as prehistoric.

Of interest is also the author's conclusion, that in ancient Babylonia the prevailing tendency was multiplication and not reduction of the deities. Then, the question whether there were monotheistic tendencies in the Babylonian religion, will have to be answered in the negative. However, we must remember that the tendency to the multiplication of gods was the result of political conditions. Ancient Babylonia consisted of many

independent localities. Each of them was anxious to be on good terms with all the personified powers of nature. Therefore, each town erected temples and shrines to these deities and worshipped them under different names. As soon as the country was united, it was natural that the process of multiplication should give way to that of reduction. In a united Babylonia, each phenomenon of nature ought to have been represented by a single deity. Hence, triplets or duplicates logically had not the least right of existence. Theoretically there may have been, in a later age, a tendency to the reduction of gods; practically, however, it was checked by the priests of the superfluous deities.

Les Lettres de Hammurabi à Sin-idinnam. Transcription, Traduction et Commentaire. Par F. CHARLES JEAN, Professeur de Sciences Bibliques. Précédées d'une Étude sur deux caractères du style Assyro-Babylonien. Paris: VICTOR LECOFFRE, 1913. pp. 280.

The letters of Hammurabi are historically of peculiar interest, as they present the great Babylonian legislator as administrator of his empire, and show the justification of his claim as being 'king of righteousness'. He personally supervised and controlled all departments of his government. They also demonstrate the effective supervision which he exercised over the decisions of the courts in districts which were situated at some distance from the capital. From these letters which are addressed to a high official who was in all probability governor of Larsa, in South Babylonia, we may infer that Hammurabi stood in correspondence with all the governors of his empire, and was interested in the minutest affairs of all his subjects.

The present volume contains fifty-five letters of Hammurabi in transliteration and translation arranged according to the subjects. These letters had already been published in 1898-1900 by L. W. King, with transliterations and translations, in his book *The Letters and Inscriptions of Hammurabi*, London. Seeing that King's book had been published before the Code of Hammurabi was discovered and before a great many documents of the Hammurabi period were edited, one naturally expects to

find in a recent publication of the same subject some improvements on the previous edition, since the author declares : ' Notre traduction est faite directement sur le texte cunéiforme ' (p. 75). In comparing letter by letter the text with both transliterations and translations, the present writer was rather disappointed in this respect. He found that both are identical to the minutest details. The author, however, is not to blame for having accepted King's rendering of the contents after having convinced himself of its exactness by a comparison with the original. But we are surprised to find that the author everywhere accepted King's reading of proper names, which is in many points incorrect. One who deals with documents of the Hammurabi period ought to make a thorough study of proper names, and especially consult Ranke's work *Early Babylonian Personal Names*. The author reads with King : *Ana-mi-ni-shu-e-mid*, *Mi-ni-Shamash*, *Mi-ni-Sin*, *Mi-ni-Mar-tu*, without knowing that *mi-ni* in these names is to be read *šilli(-li)* ; *Ilu-ka-Sin*, *Ilu-ka-Shamash*, *E-nu-ka-Ishtar*, instead of *Ilu-bi-Sin*, *Ilu-bi-Shamash*, *E-til-bi-Ishtar*, without being aware of the fact that KA in these names is an ideogram for *pū* 'mouth' and frequently changes with *bi* *Shum-ma-an-la-ilu*, instead of *Shum-ma-ilu-la-ilu*, *A-ni-ellati* for *A-li-ellati*, *Ma-sha-tum* for *Ma-ta-tum*, which is of course identical with Hebrew מַתָּה 'gift'. He even reads with King *A-bu-um-wa-ga...*, without knowing that the name *A-bu-um-wa-ḫar* often occurs in the Hammurabi period. That the author mistook Babylonian LI for the Roman numerals 51 (p. 130, 10) may be due to absent-mindedness. The misprints in the registration numbers make a comparison of the letters with the cuneiform text somewhat laborious.

However, in spite of these inaccuracies, the book is not without merits. From numerous foot-notes containing well-known facts, we may infer that the book was written for non-Assyriologists, evidently for students of theology, who are interested only in the contents, not in the proper names. It contains also a useful description of the style of the cuneiform literature of both Babylonians and Assyrians.

Le Code de Hamourabi, et ses Origines. Aperçu sommaire du Droit chaldéen par DOMINIQUE MIRANDE, Président de Chambre Honoraire à la Cour d'Appel de Paris. Paris: ERNEST LEROUX, 1913. pp. 84.

The present work consists of four discourses delivered with French esprit and vivacity. The first discourse, entitled 'The Prehistoric Chaldaea', discussed various theories concerning the geological periods, the origin of human race and other philosophical topics. The second contains reflections on the early history of Shumer and Akkad. The third is called 'A visit to the Museum of the Louvre', which gives a description of the Code of Hammurabi, of its being discovered at Susa, and how it was carried to this city in the twelfth century B.C. by the king of Elam, Shutruk-naḥunte, illustrating it by examples from the ancient and modern history. The fourth discusses the Babylonian legal principles which are illustrated by extracts from the Code and other legal documents.

The work is written for the general reader, though for this purpose it contains too much erudition. The venerable author is a former President of the Paris Court of Appeals, and has devoted, as he informs us, half a century to the study and application of French jurisprudence. The marvellous discoveries of recent years suggested to him this work, for the principal elements of which he is indebted to the lectures of the French scholars Flach and Fossey. Thus being an amateur, he is not to blame for some inaccuracies and obsolete views found in his work. He places Sargon of Akkad about twelve hundred or one thousand years after Manishtusu (pp. 2, 26, 34), while the latter actually was the successor of the former. Sin-idinam, the governor under Hammurabi, is identified by the author with the king of Larsa of the same name. This identification was suggested eighteen years ago by Father Scheil (*Revue Biblique*, vol. V, p. 600 f.), but is now generally recognized as nigh impossible. The biblical name Amraphel is still explained as a Babylonian translation Ammu-rapaltu of the West Semitic

name Hammurabi, an interpretation discarded long ago. His transliteration of Sumerian words is peculiar, as, for example, who would recognize in *Kadanjuraki* the Sumerian name *Ka-dingir-ra-ki* of Babylon, or in *Sin-turki* the other Sumerian name *Tin-tir-ki* of this city?

Le Palais de Darius I^{er}. Simple notice par M. L. PILLET, Architecte diplômé par le Gouvernement. Paris: PAUL GEUTHNER, 1914. pp. 106, illustrations 32 and a map.

One might be inclined to think that a book which describes the ruins of King Darius's palace should be of interest only to an architect, and has no connexion with Semitic studies. Yet there is a reason why a Semitist should also be interested in the architecture of this king's palace. The Book of Esther contains a description of some parts of the palace of the king Ahasuerus. This palace was utterly destroyed by Alexander the Great. If the author of this book did not live in the Persian period, as the modern critics generally contend, he could not have been acquainted with the structure of this palace. Thus the question whether this book is historical largely depends upon a comparison of its description with the excavated ruins of this palace. Students who are not acquainted with the work of M. Dieulafoy, *L'Acropole de Suse*, Paris, 1890, will find in this work some useful information on the subject. However, the book is especially written for visitors to the Parisian Museums, as the author declares, to give them some information about the history of Susa, and not for students. The author also reviews the history of the excavations at Susa. The book is pleasant reading and instructive. Interesting are its beautiful illustrations, especially Nos. 22, 23, 26, in which the palace is presented in its former splendour.

Dropsie College.

JACOB HOSCHANDER.